

# ABOUT GROWTH

A Quarterly Publication About Growth Management

Spring 1994

Washington State Dept. of  
Community, Trade and  
Economic Development  
*Stronger Communities  
For a Better Washington*

## GMA goals, vision achieve consistency

Busse Nutley  
Clark County Commissioner



One of the more challenging concepts that the state Legislature included in the Growth Management Act was that cities and counties, which had been content to disregard each other

since statehood, not only had to develop comprehensive plans but had to ensure their plans were consistent with each other.

But that's not all. To make the exercise even more intriguing, the GMA legislation required that elements within each plan also needed to be consistent with each other.

So where to begin? The GMA provides broad guidelines that point us in the right

general direction. But it is up to local communities to more specifically define our individual interests, expectations, and emphasis as we attempt to balance GMA's goals and reach consistency among the elements of our plans.

The more information we have about our community's priorities, the easier it becomes to identify the unique balance that makes sense and works for us.

In Clark County, before planners ever put pen to paper, we asked residents to work together to define a long-term vision for our community. The result, our Community Framework Plan adopted by the Board of Commissioners in April 1993, gives us a 50-year horizon as a reference point for our process. The framework plan's policies define a clear, substantive planning vision as we attempt to balance the goals of GMA.

*Continued on page 5.*

## DCD merges with Trade and Economic Development to form new agency

The state Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development is officially in place and the staffs of the two former agencies are finalizing details of how the merged functions and programs of the new agency will work together.

Merging the former Department of Community Development and former Department of Trade and Economic Development will enable state officials working in economic and community development to more efficiently and effectively serve local governments and the public.

"The merger creating CTED recognizes that economic vitality and quality of life are interdependent," said Mike Fitzgerald, director of CTED and former director of DTED. "Alone, neither are capable of fully

realizing the vision of a sustainable future for Washington."

As part of the merger process, Growth Management has been combined with the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Both offices will retain their current names and locations.

Growth management will be an important part of how the new agency delivers services.

"Comprehensive plans are huge road maps that assess a community's needs and how they will be met," said Fitzgerald. "We can use these plans to determine how to coordinate our services to help communities reach their goals."

For details about the merger, call Liz Mendizabal, CTED communications director, at 206-753-2936.





## ABOUT GROWTH

Published quarterly by the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, Growth Management Services, 906 Columbia St. SW, Olympia, WA 98504-8300. The program administers the state's Growth Management Act. Its role under the GMA is to assist and enable local governments to design their own programs to fit local needs and opportunities.

**Mike Fitzgerald, Director**  
**Steve Wells, Assistant Director**  
**Holly Gadbow, Growth Management Program Coordinator**

**Rita R. Robison, Editor**

*About Growth* will feature particular topics that are of high interest. In those issues, articles that reflect a wide range of views will be included. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily CTED's opinions or positions.

CTED is an equal opportunity employer. Women, racial and ethnic minorities, persons of disability, persons over 40 years of age, and disabled and Vietnam-era veterans are encouraged to apply for all positions within this agency.

Persons or organizations wishing to be removed from *About Growth's* mailing list may do so by notifying this office. Address corrections are encouraged and welcomed. Return mailing label to the editor with changes noted.



Printed on Recycled /  
Recyclable Paper

# New growth management official comments on GMA consistency

**Steve Wells, Assistant Director  
Growth Management Services**



I am thrilled and honored to be the assistant director for the state's growth management program, a program to which I've been passionately committed and deeply involved since the summer of 1990.

I'm also genuinely excited about the evolution of DCD into the new Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development.

With you, we are fast approaching the central milestone of GMA implementation: adoption of comprehensive plans.

As the July 1 deadline approaches for many jurisdictions planning under the act, issues become clearer, stakes rise, leaders emerge, and meaningful and important decisions get made.

These are immensely challenging months ahead, and you can call on me to maintain the high standards of commitment and support established by my predecessor, Mike McCormick.

The theme of this newsletter is *consistency*. Consistency is a check to determine how different growth management requirements fit together.

The GMA recognizes we are not islands unto ourselves. It requires the parts of each comprehensive plan be consistent. It requires development regulations that implement the plan be consistent with the plan. It requires actions taken after plan adoption be consistent with the plan. It requires the plans of adjoining jurisdictions be consistent one with the other, and it requires that state agencies comply with local plans.

As simple and reasonable as all this sounds, it's uniquely challenging.

Local jurisdictions are using different methods to achieve consistency among growth management requirements. In

Thurston County, one of the first steps under the GMA was the development of a regional transportation plan. With density guidelines for transportation corridors, cities are working on making their land use elements match the regional plan.

Clark County is relying on county-wide planning policies and community visioning to achieve consistency. Sumner used the SEPA process to make their plan elements consistent. Carnation developed a matrix to determine if plan elements were consistent with one another and county-wide planning policies.

What Growth Management Services would like to see in comprehensive plans is evidence of how you've thought about consistency requirements.

A memo is available that gives suggestions for approaching consistency. Call 206-753-2222 to request a copy.

By striving for consistency, we can give our citizens much clearer explanations for why, how, where, and when land use will be changing. By ensuring greater consistency in the common policy base under which our offices and departments operate, we will make more efficient use of our time, talent, and resources.

I invite you all to call me at any time. I look forward to getting out on the road this spring and meeting with you in your community.

## Packaging the plan

Draft comprehensive plans and draft development regulations must be submitted to CTED and other state agencies at least 60 days before adoption. CTED needs five copies. Call Growth Management Services at 206-753-2222 for a current list of other state agencies. Remember to include any SEPA documentation when submitting to CTED.

You will receive comments from CTED and other agencies about 30 days later. Within 10 days of adoption, the final plan or final regulations must be submitted to CTED and other involved state agencies.



# The matrix consistency method

Tracy Burrows, Planning Director  
1000 Friends of Washington

What is consistency? How should it be measured? This article describes a method of determining external consistency through a consistency matrix. It was used in the comprehensive plan developed by the city of Carnation. The same technique could easily be adapted to take into consideration issues of internal consistency.

A consistency matrix is an effective method of establishing how state, regional, and local growth management requirements and policies relate to one another. State requirements are articulated in the GMA itself. Regional policies are established in county-wide planning policies. Communities that also have multi-county planning policies may want to include those policies in the consistency matrix as well.

The first and second columns of the matrix establish the GMA requirement and any related county-wide planning policy(s) that must be addressed in the local plan. The third and fourth columns of the matrix show how the local plan addresses and is consistent with GMA and the county-wide planning policies.

For example, as shown below, the first row of the matrix shows state, regional, and local consistency as it relates to GMA requirements for assuring an adequate supply of housing for all economic segments of the community. The county-wide planning policies address this issue through a regional fair share allocation.

The local plan consistently carries out this approach through its benchmarks and strategies for attaining its fair share of the region's affordable housing needs. The matrix cites the policy and page number that address these issues in the local plan so that a reader can quickly find the relevant information.

The matrix is a good tool for internal review of the local plan. It can be used as a checklist to identify any potential gaps in the local comprehensive plan. It also helps anyone who reads the plan to understand how local policies related to regional and state goals. As shown below, the matrix does not show how the policies in the local plan relate to the policies adopted by adjacent jurisdictions. One could easily add an extra column to illustrate the relationship of the local plan to those of adjacent jurisdictions.

STATE	REGIONAL	LOCAL	
GMA requirement.	County-wide planning policy.	Comprehensive plan element.	Comprehensive plan policy.
36.70A.070(2)d—Adequate provision of housing for all economic segments.	AH-1—Fair Share Housing Allocation.	Housing.	HO-4.3—Establishes benchmarks and strategies for attaining city's fair share of region's affordable housing (Page HO-4).
36.70A.110 (3) Phasing of urban growth.	LU-17—Jurisdictions shall adopt 10- and 20-year phasing plans.	Land Use.	LU-3.4—Establishes phasing plan and criteria for transition to next phase—see also land use map. (Page LU-3).
36.70A.160. Identification of open space corridors.	CC-7—Open space corridors of regional significance.	Land Use.	OS-6.5—Linkages should be provided to major regional open space corridors. (Page LU-12).

## New publications are available

Part one of the Growth Management Services' draft guidebook for local governments on development regulations is now available. It has samples of development regulations and shows how local governments can integrate their regulatory reform efforts into their process for writing development regulations.

Comments from interested groups and individuals are welcome. Part two will feature non-regulatory techniques for implementing local comprehensive plans.

The office also has a new guidebook on how local governments can use the data and policies developed through their growth management work to help them put together emergency preparedness plans. Also available is a guide on how to prepare a historic preservation element for a comprehensive plan.

CTED's guidebook on the rural element is now in final form. A draft guidebook on phasing of growth also is available.

Call 206-753-2222 to request copies of these guides.

## Upcoming planning events

Mark your calendar and plan to attend these events:

### 1994 Joint Spring Planning Conference

May 18-20, Cavanaugh's Holiday Inn and Yakima Convention Center. The theme is "How Do We Collectively Achieve Our Individual Missions?" For details call Joanie Pop at 206-357-8044.

### Public and Private Rights In Land and Resources

June 3-4, Snoqualmie Room, Seattle Center. Call Polly Dyer at 206-543-1812 for further information.

### Joint Washington/Oregon American Planning Association Conference

October 5-8, Red Lion, Lloyd Center, Portland, Ore. The theme is "Northwest Passages—Legacy and Destiny in the Pacific Northwest." For information, call Nancy Cox at 206-828-1253.



# Capital facilities and utilities elements can play a major role in comprehensive plan consistency

Paula Henry, Senior Development Specialist, and  
John Rieber, Urban Planner III

Will your growth management plan be consistent? This is one of the biggest questions jurisdictions and planners will face as they develop their first plans under the Growth Management Act.

The city of Tacoma addressed this issue throughout the development phase of its plan elements by recognizing the integral relationship of planning documents and plans to one another.

The city's land use management plan elements were developed concurrently to reflect the basic need for consistency. Specifically, the capital facilities plan and program, and the utilities plan, played a major role in the consistency and predictability of providing adequate facilities and services within the city limits and its urban growth area.

The city's land use plan relies upon the future population growth, average numbers of persons per household, and land use densities; the economic plan provides for achievement of the development vision; the housing plan provides

for a housing stock strategy; and the transportation plan speaks to the movement of people and required right-of-way needs.

The role of the utilities plan is to indicate when and how public facilities will be provided to accommodate the projected housing and project by type, density, and location. The timing and cost of providing public facilities and services to meet the demand are listed in a project analysis format in the capital facilities plan and six-year program. The relationship among the city's plan elements is graphically depicted below.

Because of the relationship among plan elements, the development phase involved a massive educational and cooperative effort on the part of all stakeholders. The city of Tacoma is in a unique situation because the city owns and operates several public facilities that offer services within its city limits and to other jurisdictions. The implications of providing service in urban growth areas and the relationship to other jurisdictions and private entities, prompted city staff

to strengthen planning efforts with jurisdictions and utility companies.

A technical team comprised of representatives from all 19 city service providers, including several special purpose districts, sat at the table and collectively developed goals, policies, and implementation strategies to be included in the capital facilities plan and the utilities plan. In addition to meeting the requirements of the GMA, the technical team identified legislative consistency issues that go beyond the local level and may eventually play a part in the city's "regulatory reform" activities.

Consistency between traditional land use and utility planning practices with growth management goals can be a challenge. If a jurisdiction or utility entity can identify a "possible" balance between encouraging development in urban areas where public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner with the timing of fiscal resources, the intent of the GMA will be achievable.

## Tacoma integrated its plan using capital facilities and utilities elements to guide its plan development

Land Use

Housing

Capital  
Facilities

Utilities

Transportation

### Capital Facilities Program

- Needs Assessment
  - List of Projects
    - Level of Service
      - Funding Sources



# Sumner uses EIS as part of comprehensive plan

John Doan

Director, Sumner Community Development

The city of Sumner plan environmental impact statement will continue to be an integral part of the city's new plan in two ways. First, the city used the EIS to "build" its plan policies. As such, it contains the menu of items the city reviewed in developing the plan. Second, the EIS contains the detailed background information supporting the plan.

As a small, but growing community, the city had to consolidate their planning efforts as much as possible. The city was fortunate to have a strong planning history highlighted by a 1983 comprehensive plan, which included an eight-mile area around the four-square mile city. Using the 1983 plan as a base, the city prepared and previously adopted detailed facility plans for water, storm drainage, sanitary sewers, transportation, and parks.

The comprehensive plan update followed these major milestones:

- Adoption of vision statement;
- Preparation of community character plan;
- Publication of two land use alternatives for public comment along with draft EIS and policy analysis;
- Selection of preferred alternative;
- Development of policy plan for preferred alternative;
- Publication of final EIS;
- Plan documents and EIS sent to state; and
- Scheduled adoption of policy plan and draft EIS and final EIS.

The community character plan was developed to establish a theme for the plan and ensure consistency across the elements. The promotion of neighborhood centers and an urban village allow the city to address housing and density issues similar to the older parts of the community. Pedestrian amenities, open space protection, and efficient utility service are components of the community character plan.

In order to consolidate planning efforts and document the existing facility

plans, the EIS provides the necessary State Environmental Policy Act information and the background material required by the GMA. In addition to the discussion of impacts and mitigation for each alternative, the EIS includes the detailed housing, land use and population inventories, and projections supporting the plan.

This approach gave Sumner the ability to "build" the plan policies. After the city council selected a preferred alternative, the policies to accompany the plan were drafted. The policies were written by specifically referencing the vision statement, community character plan, the draft EIS, and an analysis of relevant goals and policies.

When the city council adopts the plan update in April, the plan will include the policy document with the

land use map and policies for the eight elements. The draft EIS and final EIS will also be adopted as a part of the new plan.

The disadvantage to this approach is that the plan will contain the two alternatives, only one of which was adopted by the city. A major benefit has been that the combined documents made it much easier for the public to understand the multitude of issues associated with this planning process.

The city did most of the work on the plan in-house. Consultants S. Chamberlain and Associates provided transportation analysis and A. Nelessen Associates prepared the community character plan.

For more information, contact the Sumner Community Development Department at 206-863-8300.

## Using GMA goals, vision to achieve consistency

Continued from page 1.

Our ongoing dialogue with the public has made it plain that we must integrate the elements differently in different parts of the county. We do not have one boilerplate formula for balancing GMA's goals countywide. The expectation—and, therefore, the balance—is different in Vancouver, our largest city, than it is in Washougal, a smaller city. And that's all right. Although our county-wide growth management plan must maintain its overall integrity—its fundamental principles, goals, and policies—it must also be flexible.

One of the strengths of our planning effort—the inclusive approach that encompassed staff from all our cities, representatives from interest groups, special districts, and utilities, and citizens—has a drawback. Because the elements have been developed by a variety of committees, staff efforts, and individual sub-processes, some of them are not yet consistent with each other. A participatory process is more complicated—and certainly less tidy—than planning in a vacuum!

To resolve the inconsistencies, we will need to identify alternatives and measure them against the overall vision for our plan. This will help us determine how best to integrate the elements and decide which will be given priority.

As we make changes, we will offer additional opportunities for the public to review and comment on our proposals. This will provide us with an ongoing reality check—a way to measure how closely our drafts continue to match residents' vision of Clark County's future.

All of us will ultimately be accountable for the decisions we make. To achieve consistency we must change our behaviors as jurisdictions and agencies, and begin meeting the expectations of our plan and living up to its regulatory implications. Our citizens will hold us accountable.

Clark County cannot act singularly, and growth management puts responsibility over much wider interests than the county alone. A principal challenge is for all of the policy instruments and players to build a shared vision and to design a strategy for shared action.



### State review of plans is underway

The state is reviewing the first of 237 comprehensive plans being developed to implement the Growth Management Act. Twenty-two plans have been submitted so far, from cities ranging from La Conner to Tacoma. The intent of state review is to provide technical assistance and ensure compliance with the GMA.

The most common issues that have come up in reviewing these plans center around the issue of consistency. Jurisdictions are using a variety of strategies to deal with this requirement.

To help assure consistency between county-wide planning policies and comprehensive plans, one city adopted the county-wide policies as their comprehensive plan goals and policies. Another city used a matrix to compare county-wide planning policies and their plan. This assures that each appropriate county-wide planning policy is addressed, and that each is consistent with the plan.

These two strategies should help jurisdictions be consistent with county-wide planning policies and, hence, consistent with their neighboring jurisdictions.

Some common difficulties in making the elements of a comprehensive plan consistent are found when comprehensive plans pull together separate functional plans, such as an existing sewer, stormwater, and water service plans. These separate functional plans sometimes have different urban growth areas or service areas, resulting in different urban services in different areas in the plans without a reason or strategy for these differences.

When comprehensive plans use other functional plans to support their land use and housing elements, there are often different and conflicting projections for population growth and development build out. These projections are used to estimate the capacity of public facilities and will cause problems in providing services as the jurisdiction grows.

Many smaller jurisdictions provide few services themselves and contract for services from others. A common omission from these small jurisdictions' plans is the failure to document other agencies' ability to serve them.

Another inconsistency among elements of plans reviewed include recommending improvements in the transportation element and not financing the improvements in the capital facilities element. Capital projects must be a part of the comprehensive plan before the jurisdiction can spend money on them.

Some inconsistencies found were as simple as differences in plan text and maps. Some of the most often missed requirements in draft plans were essential public facilities, special needs housing, and a strategy on how the final urban growth areas will be reconciled with the comprehensive plan.

## Fair share housing policies important in housing consistency

David Osterberg  
Senior Housing Planner, Snohomish County

In the first amendment to the Growth Management Act in 1991, the Legislature added provisions to the statute requiring counties to adopt county-wide planning policies to ensure the consistency of city and county comprehensive plans. The policies were required to consider a variety of issues, including the "need for affordable housing, such as housing for all economic segments of the population and parameters for its distribution."

In Snohomish County, county-wide planning policies were enacted that committed all jurisdictions to adopt and implement a fair share distribution of low-income and special needs housing, to collaborate in formulating a fair share housing allocation methodology, and to implement a coordinated monitoring program to evaluate jurisdictions' progress towards achieving housing goals and objectives on a county-wide and jurisdictional level.

The Snohomish County Fair Share Housing Allocation Methodology & Guidelines was formally accepted by the county-wide GMA policy board of elected officials in January, after more than a year of discussion and review by a planning staff committee, a planning directors' technical advisory committee, and a citizens' GMA advisory board.

The methodology and guidelines contain: 1) a definition and means of empirically assessing existing and projected housing needs; 2) a method of calculating each jurisdiction's fair share of existing and projected housing needs; and 3) guidelines for providing for each jurisdiction's fair share housing allocation. The methodology and guidelines were distributed to each jurisdiction along with a 26-page companion document which summarized several dozen strategies that may be implemented to help jurisdictions

achieve their fair share housing objectives.

Each jurisdiction's fair share housing allocation is determined by means of a formula that includes an estimate of the number of households in each jurisdiction with housing needs. Also included is a "jobs factor" which is used to encourage lower cost housing in areas adjacent to lower paying jobs and a "housing factor" which increases the housing allocation for jurisdictions with a comparatively small proportion of lower cost housing.

The methodology and guidelines state that each jurisdiction's fair share housing allocation represents the number of existing and projected households with housing needs for which it should plan.

For example, these communities have the following planning targets for existing and new low- and moderate-income households over the next 20 years: Snohomish County, 28,277; Everett, 8,065; and Darrington, 69.

Although the methodology and guidelines leave it to each jurisdiction to decide specifically how it will plan to meet its GMA housing obligations, additional direction is provided to further synchronize jurisdictions' housing efforts.

Guidelines include: 1) how much housing to provide at various cost levels under each jurisdiction's fair share allocation; 2) the siting of special needs housing; 3) the calculation of land-use density objectives to accommodate each jurisdiction's fair share housing allocation; and 4) methods for transferring a jurisdiction's fair share housing allocation from one jurisdiction to another.



# Cases before state's growth planning hearings boards

Listed below are new cases or action on existing cases before the state's growth planning hearings boards.

## Central Puget Sound

**CASE NO. 93-3-0005 STATUS: DECISION 10/6/93; COMPLIANCE ORDER ISSUED 3/25/94**

Cities of Edmonds and Lynnwood vs. Snohomish County. Subject: Population forecasts and county-wide planning policies.

**CASE NO. 93-3-0010 STATUS: DECISION DUE 6/3/94**

Association of Rural Residents vs. Kitsap County. Subject: Interim Urban Growth Area for Kingston.

**CASE NO. 94-3-0001 STATUS: HEARING ON MOTIONS 3/31/94; HEARING ON MERITS 4/12/94**

Cities of Tacoma, Milton, Sumner, and Puyallup vs. Pierce County. Subject: Interim urban growth areas.

**CASE NO. 94-3-0002 STATUS: HEARING ON MOTIONS 4/15/94; HEARING ON MERITS 5/24/94**

Pilchuck Audubon Society and Snohomish Wetlands Alliance vs. Snohomish County. Subject: Interim critical area regulations and development regulations.

**CASE NO. 94-3-0003 STATUS: HEARING ON MOTIONS 4/6/94; HEARING ON MERITS 5/26/94**

Friends of the Law and Bear Creek Citizens for Growth Management vs. King County. Subject: Critical areas, resource lands, and interim urban growth areas.

**CASE NO. 94-3-0004 STATUS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE 4/25/94; HEARING ON MERITS 7/7/94**

City of Black Diamond and Black Diamond Associates Ltd. vs. King County. Subject: Interim urban growth area.

## Western Washington

**CASE NO. 93-02-0002 STATUS: WITHDRAWN 1/24/94**

City of Port Angeles vs. Clallam County. Subject: Interim urban growth areas.

**CASE NO. 94-02-0001 STATUS: PETITION FILED 1/18/94; HEARING 5/12/94**

North Cascades Audubon Society, et. al. vs. Whatcom County. Subject: Temporary critical areas ordinance.

**CASE NO. 94-2-0002 STATUS: PETITION FILED 2/3/94; HEARING 5/25/94**

Donald Berschauer vs. City of Tumwater. Subject: Review of part of the city's land use plan.

**CASE NO. 94-2-0003 STATUS: PETITION FILED 3/9/94; HEARING 6/9/94**

Watershed Defense Fund, et. al. vs. Whatcom County. Subject: Interim urban growth areas.

**CASE NO. 94-2-0004 STATUS: PETITION FILED 3/10/94; HEARING 6/30/94**

City of Port Townsend vs. Jefferson County. Subject: Interim urban growth areas.

## Eastern Washington

**CASE NO. 93-1-0002 STATUS: COMPLIANCE HEARING 2/1/94**

Merrill English and Project for Informed Citizens vs. Columbia County, 1000 Friends of Washington, Intervenor. Pacific Legal Foundation, Amicus Curiae. Subject: Resource lands and critical areas. The board ruled county in compliance.

**CASE NO. 94-1-0001 STATUS: PETITION FILED 1/5/94; HEARING 5/12/94**

Save Our Butte Save Our Basin Society vs. Chelan County. Subject: Interim urban growth area.

**CASE NO. 94-1-0002 STATUS: PETITION FILED 1/27/94; DECISION 2/23/94**

Yakima Indian Nation vs. Kittitas County. Subject: Critical areas. Board ordered county to designate and protect critical areas by 6/8/94.

**CASE NO. 94-1-0015 STATUS: PETITIONS FILED 1/28-2/7/94; HEARING ON MOTIONS 5/17/94; FINAL HEARING 6/29/94**

The following plaintiffs filed individual petitions against Chelan County that were consolidated into one case: Save Our Butte Save Our Basin Society; Icicle Canyon Coalition; North Central Audubon Society; Suzanne Saberhagen; Save Chelan Alliance; LEAF Adopt-A-Forest; Yakima Indian Nation; Citizens for Rural Environment and Agricultural Land; Chelan-Douglas Land Trust; Chelan County Conservation District; 1000 Friends of Washington; North Cascades Conservation Council and Washington Environmental Council; Washington State by and through the director of the Department of Community Development on behalf of the Commissioner of Public Lands and the directors of the Departments of Fisheries and Wildlife. Subject: Interim regulations for resource lands and critical areas.

**CASE NO. 94-1-0017 STATUS: FILED 1/31/94 AND 3/7/94; PREHEARING CONFERENCE 3/23/94; HEARING 6/1/94**

RIDGE vs. Kittitas County; and Kittitas Audubon Society and Alpine Lake Trail Riders Chapter of Back Country Horsemen Association vs. Kittitas County. Two cases consolidated. Subject: Forest lands designation.



# Achieving consistency through regional transportation

Harold Robertson  
Executive Director,  
Thurston Regional Planning Council



One major way a county and the cities within it can make comprehensive plans consistent is to work cooperatively to

achieve regional goals for transportation.

Thurston County's jurisdictions worked together through the Thurston Regional Planning Council to prepare a new regional transportation plan, adopted by the council in 1993.

A goal of that plan is to dramatically reduce the percentage of people who drive alone to work. Today's drive-alone rate is 85 percent; our goal is 60 percent in 20 years.

Work now underway on comprehensive plans incorporates the policies, density targets, and transportation projects of the regional transportation plan that are designed to reach that goal. In 1993, citizens and elected officials analyzed options and chose a less car-dependent future. People said they want

to "get a handle on the rapid growth of traffic and dependence on cars," "prevent sprawl," "develop vital city centers," "protect air and water quality," and "give people more transportation options and housing choices."

The vision of the regional transportation plan is to focus the development of jobs, housing, shopping, and recreation opportunities in city centers and along main travel routes between them. Transportation improvements focus on transit and making more connections with small roads, rather than depending on wider and wider arterials.

Changes in how we grow, however, are also critical to achieving transportation goals. Well designed, higher densities in strategic locations, supported by a transportation system that gives people choices is our best hope to avoid choking on traffic.

In the regional transportation plan, "core areas" are envisioned to contain 15-plus residential units per acre and 25-plus employees per acre in concentrated areas.

"High density residential corridors" would connect the core areas. Along high density residential corridors, 15-plus dwelling units per acre are planned within 1/4 mile of the main road.

Excellent transit service is planned for core areas and high density residential corridors.

"Medium density residential corridors" elsewhere in the community are intended to have housing densities averaging 7 units per acre within 1/4 mile of those routes.

At that density, good transit service will be possible. City and towns within the rural area will be connected to the urban area by express transit serving park-and-ride lots.

The council, with support from the Washington State Department of Transportation, examined further how auto-oriented arterials could become the high density residential corridors envisioned in the regional transportation plan. We analyzed how one of the corridors might develop over time. The product was a brochure heavy on graphic presentation.

In the brochure, the vision was described and illustrated, obstacles were analyzed, and action steps were recommended. Citizens, builders, lenders, real estate professionals, and planners were presented a clear picture of how a corridor could evolve, as well as what could be done to make it happen.

So far, this approach seems to be effective. In their current work on comprehensive plans, the cities in the county are pursuing the development pattern and density targets contained in the regional transportation plan.

■ Washington State  
**Department of Community, Trade  
and Economic Development**  
Growth Management Services

906 Columbia St. SW  
PO BOX 48300  
Olympia, WA 98504-8300

© 27

**BULK RATE**  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Washington State  
Dept. of Printing  
Olympia, WA